

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-17 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the specification for informalities and grammatical errors. Applicants respectfully assert the specification as filed, did not contain the errors indicated in the Office Action, but the errors were introduced by the Patent Office as evidenced by the associated filings recorded in the Public Pair Database. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the specification.

Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 3 and 4 for grammatical errors. Claim 3 is amended to obviate the objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claims 3 and 4.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-17 are amended to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdrawal the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 5-17 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for failing to claim statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1, 2 and 5-17 claim statutory subject matter under MPEP §2106 IV because they claim a system on a hardware apparatus and a device (a machine). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdrawal the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,069,536 to Yaung. Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 8, 12, 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061266 to Ouchi; rejects claims 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,226 to Tarumi et al. (hereinafter "Tarumi"); rejects claims 10 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,200,860 to Ghaffar; and rejects claims 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0005229 to Palekar et al. (hereinafter "Palekar").

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action asserts that Yaung teaches all of the features recited in independent claims 1, 3 and 5-7. However, Yaung does not teach or suggest performing specified multiple processings of document data including at least "a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of each of the multiple processings based on contents recited in the notice condition data," as recited in independent claims 1, 3 and 5-7.

Yaung, in col. 6, lines 20-38 and col. 7, lines 55-59, teaches the sending of a notification feature that only notifies the user associated with the start node that a deadline has passed during which the user designated action for that node was not completed. However, the notification feature of Yaung is not "a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of each of the multiple processings based on contents recited in the notice condition data," as recited in independent claims 1, 3 and 5-7.

Ouchi, Tarumi, Ghaffar and Palekar fail to disclose or suggest the above features, and therefore, fail to make up for the above noted deficiency of Yaung.

For at least the reasons above, Yaung cannot reasonably be considered to teach or to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 3 and 5-7. Further, claims 2, 4 and 8-17 would also not have been suggested by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims on allowable independent claims 1, 3 and 5-7, respectively, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Tiffany J. Brooks  
Registration No. 57,912

JAO:TJB/mab

Date: September 28, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--